

Remarks

Claims 23-42 are pending in this application with claims 23-30 being independent. Claims 1-16 were previously canceled. In this amendment, claims 17-22 have been canceled and claims 23, 24, 27, 28 and 39-42 have been amended.

Claims 23 and 25 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Yudasaka. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 and 25 because neither Graff, Yudasaka, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests using an ink jet method to form a light emitting layer and a film comprising an organic material, as recited in each of claims 23 and 25.

Apparently conceding that Graff does not describe or suggest using an ink jet method, the Examiner states that Yudasaka discloses using an ink jet method for forming a film on an EL device, and that it would have been obvious to form the film comprising the organic material using an ink jet method since, according to the Examiner, Yudasaka shows that an ink jet method is commonly used for forming layers on an EL device. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion.

Yudasaka indicates that a luminescent organic semiconductor film 43 of a thin film luminescent element 40 may be formed using an ink jet method. However, Yudasaka also indicates that the ink jet method is useable because a thick insulating film (referred to as a bank layer bank) prevents the material provided by the ink jet method from spreading (see Yudasaka at col. 2, lines 41-48). Thus, Yudasaka only describes using an ink jet method to form a film when the bank layer bank can be used to prevent the film from spreading.

In Yudasaka, the electrode *op* that is formed on the film 43 is also formed on the bank layer bank. As such, any layer that is formed on this electrode, such as the recited film comprising an organic material that is formed on a film comprising an inorganic material that covers the EL element, would not be prevented from spreading by the bank layer bank. As such, Yudasaka would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to use an ink jet method to form a film on the electrode. Accordingly, since claims 23 and 25 recite that the film comprising the organic material is formed on another film that covers an EL element, including the EL element

of the electrode, Yudasaka would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to use an ink jet method to form such a film. For at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 and 25.

In addition, with respect to claim 23, neither Graff, Yudasaka, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests using the same film deposition apparatus to continuously form a light emitting layer, an electrode, a film comprising an inorganic material, and a film comprising an organic material. While the Examiner indicates that Graff describes doing so at col. 4, lines 27-65, that passage is silent as to this element of claim 23. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 for this additional reason.

Claims 24 and 26 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Yudasaka. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24 and 26 because neither Suzuki, Yudasaka, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests using an ink jet method to form a light emitting layer and a film comprising an organic material, as recited in each of claims 24 and 26.

Similarly to the rejection of claims 23 and 25, the Examiner apparently concedes that Suzuki does not describe or suggest using an ink jet method, and turns to Yudasaka as leading one of ordinary skill in the art to do so. However, as discussed above with respect to claims 23 and 25, Yudasaka would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to use an ink jet method to form the two layers in the manner recited in claims 24 and 26. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the rejection of claims 24 and 26 should be withdrawn.

In addition, with respect to claim 24, neither Suzuki, Yudasaka, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests using the same film deposition apparatus to continuously form a light emitting layer, an electrode, a film comprising an inorganic material, and a film comprising an organic material. While the Examiner indicates that Suzuki does so, the Examiner provides no indication of where, and applicant has been unable to find any corresponding discussion in Suzuki. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 for this additional reason.

Claim 27 and its dependent claims 31, 35 and 39 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Hirai. Claim 27 recites, among other elements, that an electric field application method is used to form a light emitting layer and a film comprising an organic material. The electric field application method is illustrated in Fig. 1C of the application and discussed, for example, at page 6, line 17 to page 7, line 10.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Graff, Hirai, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests using an electric field application method to form a light emitting layer and a film comprising an organic material. Recognizing that Graff does not describe an electric field application method, the Examiner points to Hirai's statement at col. 2, lines 45-48, that a film may be formed through "polymerization under an electric field." However, this statement does not describe an electric field application method such as is recited in claim 27. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 and its dependent claims.

Claim 28 and its dependent claims 32, 36 and 40 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hirai and Yudasaka. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Suzuki, Hirai, Yudasaka, nor any combination of these references describes or suggests using an electric field application method to form a light emitting layer and a film comprising an organic material. As with claim 27, the Examiner relies upon Hirai as disclosing the electric field application method. However, as discussed above, Hirai fails to do so. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28 and its dependent claims.

Claim 29 and its dependent claims 33, 37 and 41 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Hirai. Like claim 27, claim 29 recites using an electric field application method to form a light emitting layer and a film comprising an organic material. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29 and its dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27.

In addition, neither Graff, Hirai, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests using the same film deposition apparatus to continuously form a light emitting layer, an

Applicant : Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al  
Serial No. : 09/817,675  
Filed : March 27, 2001  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-024001 / US4798

electrode, a film comprising an inorganic material, and a film comprising an organic material, as recited in claim 29. As noted above, while the Examiner indicates that Graff describes doing so at col. 4, lines 27-65, that passage is silent as to this element of claim 29. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29 and its dependent claims for this additional reason.

Claim 30 and its dependent claims 34, 38 and 42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hirai and Yudasaka. Similarly to claim 28, claim 30 recites using an electric field application method to form an EL element and a film comprising an organic material. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 and its dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 28.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$110 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/24/04

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331